# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: EDISON PARK CREATIVE AND EXPRESSIVE ARTS SCHOOL

District Name: Lee

Principal: Dr. Carl Brunick

SAC Chair: Rebecca Jones

Superintendent: Joseph Burke, Ed. D.

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/22/2012



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor K-12 Public Schools Florida Department of Education 325 West Gaines Street Tallahassee, Florida 32399

#### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

#### **ADMINISTRATORS**

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

| Position  | Name                | Degree(s)/<br>Certification(s)  | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include<br>prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide<br>Assessment Achievement Levels,<br>Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and<br>AMO Progress along with the<br>associated school year)   |
|-----------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Dr. Carl<br>Brunick | Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education Master's Degree in Elementary Education/Psychology Doctorate Degree in Educational Leadership | 2                                     | 34                                   | * Gateway Magnet School-No grade at that time  * Tanglewood Elementary "A" school. Prior year to becoming a principal " D" school.  * Fort Myers Beach Elementary "A" school all four years. Made AYP all four years. All third grade students met reading standards 3 of 4 years. Only one studnet did not meet state standard (FCAT) one year.Prior year school was a "B"  *Edison Park was listed "B" 2009-2010; 2010-2011 years. I became principal in 2011-2012, school grade was listed as an "A". |

#### **INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES**

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers

in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

|                 | Name | Degree(s)/<br>Certification<br>(s) | # of<br>Years<br>at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Instructional<br>Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------------|------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| No data submitt | ed   |                                    |  |   |   |

#### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

|   | Description of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible         | Projected<br>Completion<br>Date | Not Applicable (If not, please<br>explain why) |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Regular meetings of teachers with Principal to ensure all needs are met. | Principal                     | Ongoing                         |  |
| 2 |  | Principal &<br>Beth Sitterson | Ongoing                         |  |
| 3 | The ongoing refining of a postive, collaborative and supportive climate. | All Staff                     | Ongoing                         |  |

#### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

| number or staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out- of-field / and | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| No data submitted  |   |

#### Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

\*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| Total Number<br>of<br>Instructional<br>Staff | % of<br>First-Year<br>Teachers |          | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 6-14<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 15+<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with<br>Advanced<br>Degrees | % Highly<br>Effective<br>Teachers | % Reading<br>Endorsed | % National<br>Board<br>Certified<br>Teachers | % ESOL<br>Endorsed<br>Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 34   | 2.9%(1)                        | 26.5%(9) | 32.4%(11)   | 38.2%(13)  | 32.4%(11)                                       | 94.1%(32)                         | 8.8%(3)               | 5.9%(2)                                      | 58.8%(20)                      |

#### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Rationale<br>Assigned for Pairing |  | Planned Mentoring<br>Activities |
|-------------|--|--|---------------------------------|
|             |  |  |                                 |

### Coordination and Integration

#### Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

| Title I, Part A  |
|--|
|  |
| Title I, Part C- Migrant   |
|  |
| Title I, Part D  |
|  |
| Title II   |
|  |
|  |
| Title X- Homeless  |
|  |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)  |
|  |
| Violence Prevention Programs   |
|  |
| Nutrition Programs   |
| Lousing Programs   |
| Trousing Programs  |
| Head Start   |
|  |
| Adult Education  |
|  |
| Career and Technical Education   |
|  |
| Job Training   |
|  |
| Other State of the Control of the Co |
|  |
| Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)  |

-School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team for Edison Park Elementary consists of the following members: Carl Brunick(Principal), Beth Sitterson (Reading Specialist), Linda Bruner (Guidance Counselor), school psychologist, various classroom teachers; anyone else necessary to meet the needs of the student (speech pathologist, ESOL contact, school nurse, behavior specialist, social worker).

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The MTSS Leadership team at Edison Park Elementary meets on an as needed basis to analyze school and/or student progress data in order to monitor the progress of students receiving interventions and to identify students in need of more support. The team uses the five-step problem solving process as outlined in the district's Response to Multi-Tiered system of Support Manual. The roles of each member are as follows:

#### Classroom Teachers

- Keep ongoing progress monitoring notes in a MTSS folder (FAIR, curriculum assessments, SAT 10 or FCAT scores, work samples, anecdotal) to be filed in cumulative folder at the end of each school year or if transferring/withdrawing
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to collaborate on & monitor students who are struggling
- •Implement interventions designed by RTI Team for students in Tier 2 & 3
- Deliver instructional interventions with fidelity

Reading or Math Coach/Specialist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings
- Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, differentiated instruction
- •Implement Tier 2 & 3 interventions
- Keep progress monitoring notes & anecdotal of interventions implemented
- · Administer screenings
- Collect school-wide data for team to use in determining at-risk students

Principal/Principal Designee

- Facilitate implementation of MTSS in your building
- Provide or coordinate valuable and continuous professional development
- Assign paraprofessionals to support MTSS implementation when possible
- Attend MTSS Team meetings to be active in the RTI change process
- •Conduct classroom Walk-Throughs to monitor fidelity

Guidance Counselor/Curriculum Specialist

- •Often MTSS Team facilitators
- Schedule and attend MTSS Team meetings
- Maintain log of all students involved in the RTI process
- Send parent invites
- Complete necessary MTSS forms
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews when requested

School Psychologist

- Attend MTSS Team meetings on some students in Tier 2 & on all students in Tier 3
- ·Monitor data collection process for fidelity
- •Review and interpret progress monitoring data
- Collaborate with MTSS Team on effective instruction & specific interventions
- •Incorporate MTSS data when guiding a possible ESE referral and when making eligibility decisions

ESE Teacher/Staffing Specialist

- •Consult with MTSS Team regarding Tier 3 3 interventions
- Incorporate MTSS data when making eligibility decisions
- Specialist (Behavior, IA, OT, PT)
- •Consult with MTSS Team
- Provide staff trainings

Social Worker

- •Attend MTSS Team meetings when requested
- Conduct social-developmental history interviews and share with MTSS team
- •ESOL/ELL Representative
- •Attend all MTSS Team meetings for identified ELL students, advising and completing LEP paperwork
- Conduct language screenings and assessments
- •Provide ELL interventions at all Tiers

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team assists with the analysis of school, classroom, and student level data in order to identify areas for school improvement. Additionally, the team assists with the evaluation of the student response to current interventions, curricula, and school systems.

#### -MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Edison Park Elementary utilizes the district adopted data management system, Pinnacle Analytics. This allows the school comprehensive access to all school and district databases, thereby assisting with the detailed analysis of district, school, classroom, and student level data. These analysis assist with the tracking of student progress, management of diagnostic, summative, and formative assessment data, and the response of students to implemented interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Lee County School District has developed a comprehensive training and support plan for schools. District teams have been established to support schools in the implementation of the RtI process for all students. The teams provide training, coaching, modeling, data analysis, and guidance to assist schools with the implementation of supplemental and intensive strategies designed to improve the educational outcomes for students with academic and behavioral needs.

The teams are comprised of teachers with knowledge in effective instructional practices, data analysis, behavior management techniques, and ESOL strategies. All team members are provided on-going staff development training regarding the MTSS process and research based practices to support the academic and behavioral needs of students.

| Describe the plan to support MTSS. |
|------------------------------------|
|                                    |
|                                    |

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of Linda O'Connell, Linda Bruner, Beth Sitterson, and Carl Brunick.

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).

The Literacy Team meetings are held once a month to review progress and implement changes as needed. The Principal serves as the instructional leader and primary resource contact person. The Curriculum Specialist is the professional development support information source. The remaining members are representatives from each grade level.

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?

- \*Monitor progress of lowest 25% to obtain AYP
- \*Provide support for the reading process across the content, academic and specials
- \*Provide training and report data to grade level team

#### Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment

\*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

\*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

| For schools with                            | Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher                                     |
|---|--|
|   |  |
| *High Schools                               | Only   |
| Note: Required fo                           | r High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.   |
| How does the sch                            | nool incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and future?                                  |
|   |  |
|   | nool incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that<br>of study is personally meaningful? |
| Postsecondary                               | Transition   |
| Note: Required fo                           | or High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.   |
| Describe strategi<br><u>Feedback Report</u> | es for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High Sch</u>                                |
|   |  |
|   |  |

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

# Reading Goals

| * When u  | using percentages,                       | include th                | ne number of students th        | ne perc | entage repres  | ents              | (e.g., 70% (35)).  |              |                                      |
|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|--|-------------------|--|--------------|--------------------------------------|
|   | on the analysis of<br>ovement for the fo |                           | achievement data, and<br>group: | d refer | ence to "Gui   | ding              | Questions", identify   | and o        | define areas in nee                  |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:   |  |                           |                                 |         | In 2011-2012, 39% of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AN report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. |                   |  |              |                                      |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  |  |                           |                                 |         | 2013 Expe  | cted              | Level of Performa  | nce:         |                                      |
| In 2010-2011, 39% (19 students)of students in the Black subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. |  |                           |                                 |         | subgroup so increase fro   | oring<br>m 39     | ne percentage of stu<br>g levels 3-5 on the F<br>g% to 46% (19 stud<br>rbor Criteria as repo | CAT Fents of | Reading Test will of 42) to meet AYP |
|   |  | Pro                       | blem-Solving Proces             | ss to I | ncrease Stu  | ıden <sup>.</sup> | t Achievement  |              |                                      |
|   | Anticipated Ba                           | icipated Barrier Strategy |                                 | R       | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible f<br>Monitoring  |                   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                                 |              | Evaluation Tool                      |
| 1   |  |                           |                                 |         |  |                   |  |              |                                      |
| 1b. Flor<br>Studen<br>Reading   | g Goal #1b:                              | ssessme                   | ent:<br>, and 6 in reading.     |         |  |                   |  |              |                                      |
| 2012 Cu   | urrent Level of I                        | Performa                  | ance:                           |         | 2013 Expe  | cted              | Level of Performa  | nce:         |                                      |
|   |  | Pro                       | blem-Solving Proces             | ss to I | ncrease Stu  | ıden <sup>.</sup> | t Achievement  |              |                                      |
| Anticip   | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Po          |                           | Posit<br>Resp<br>for            | onsible | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   |                   | Evaluation Tool  |              |                                      |
|   |  |                           | No                              | Data    | Submitted  |                   |  |              |                                      |
|   |  |                           |                                 |         |  |                   |  |              |                                      |
|   | on the analysis of<br>evement for the fo |                           | achievement data, and<br>group: | d refer | ence to "Gui   | ding              | Questions", identify   | and o        | define areas in nee                  |
| 1   | AT 2.0: Students<br>in reading.          | scoring                   | at or above Achieve             | ement   |  |                   |  |              |                                      |
| Reading   | g Goal #2a:                              |                           |                                 |         |  |                   |  |              |                                      |

| 2012 Current Level of   | Performance:          |                                     | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |                              |  |  |
|---|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
|   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
|   | Problem-Solving       | Process to I                        | ncrease S <sup>-</sup>              | tudent Achievement   |                              |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy F                                |                       | Posit<br>Resp<br>for                | on or<br>ion<br>onsible<br>toring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool              |  |  |
|   |                       |                                     | Submitted                           |  |                              |  |  |
|   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the f             |                       | data, and refer                     | ence to "G                          | uiding Questions", iden                                      | tify and define areas in nee |  |  |
| 2b. Florida Alternate A<br>Students scoring at or<br>reading. |                       | Level 7 in                          |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| Reading Goal #2b:   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of   | Performance:          |                                     | 2013 Exp                            | ected Level of Perfori                                       | mance:                       |  |  |
|   | Problem-Solving       |                                     | on or                               | tudent Achievement Process Used to                           |                              |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy              | Resp<br>for                         | onsible                             | Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                    | Evaluation Tool              |  |  |
|   |                       | No Data                             | Submitted                           |  |                              |  |  |
|   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| Based on the analysis of<br>of improvement for the f          |                       | data, and refer                     | ence to "G                          | uiding Questions", iden                                      | tify and define areas in nee |  |  |
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percenta<br>gains in reading.                   | age of students makin | g learning                          |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| Reading Goal #3a:   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of   |                       | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
|   |                       |                                     |                                     |  |                              |  |  |
|   | Problem-Solving       | g Process to I                      | ncrease S                           | tudent Achievement   |                              |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy                                  |                       | Posit<br>Resp<br>for                | onsible                             | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool              |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy              | Resp<br>for<br>Moni                 |                                     | Effectiveness of   | Evaluation Tool              |  |  |

| Based on the a of improvemen                                    | nalysis of st<br>t for the follo | udent achieveme<br>owing group:  | ent data, and | d refere   | nce to "Gu                          | uiding Ques                                    | tions", identify                 | and (        | define areas in need         |
|---|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Al<br>Percentage of<br>reading.                     |                                  | essment:<br>naking Learning      | g Gains in    |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |
| Reading Goal  | #3b:                             |                                  |               |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |
| 2012 Current  | Level of Pe                      | rformance:                       |               | ,  | 2013 Expe                           | ected Leve                                     | el of Performar                  | nce:         |                              |
|   |                                  |                                  |               |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |
|   |                                  | Problem-Sol                      | ving Proces   | s to In  | icrease St                          | udent Ach                                      | nievement                        |              |                              |
| Anticipated B   | arrier S                         | Strategy                         |               | Person<br>Position<br>Responsion<br>for<br>Monitor | on<br>onsible                       | Process U<br>Determin<br>Effective<br>Strategy | е                                | Eval         | luation Tool                 |
|   |                                  |                                  | No            | Data Sı  | ubmitted                            | •  |                                  |              |                              |
|   |                                  |                                  |               |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |
| Based on the a of improvemen                                    |                                  |                                  | ent data, and | d refere   | nce to "Gu                          | uiding Ques                                    | stions", identify                | and (        | define areas in need         |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: P<br>making learni<br>Reading Goal                 | ng gains in                      | of students in L<br>reading.     | owest 25%     | ı  |                                     |  | students in the ling gains on FC |              | it 25% ( 29 of 43<br>eading. |
| 2012 Current  | Level of Pe                      | rformance:                       |               | 4  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |                                  |              |                              |
| In 2012, 65%<br>made learning                                   | `                                | s) of students in<br>AT Reading. | the lowest 2  |  |                                     | 3, we will ir<br>Reading Re                    | nprove to 69% oort.              | as m         | easured by the               |
|   |                                  | Problem-Sol                      | ving Proces   | s to In  | icrease St                          | udent Ach                                      | nievement                        |              |                              |
| Anticipated B   | arrier S                         | Strategy                         |               | Person<br>Position<br>Responsion<br>for<br>Monitor | ion Determine Effectiveness of      |  |                                  | luation Tool |                              |
|   |                                  |                                  | No            | Data Si  | ubmitted                            |  |                                  |              |                              |
|   |                                  |                                  |               |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |
| Based on Ambi   | tious but Acl                    | hievable Annual                  | Measurable (  | Objectiv   | ves (AMOs)                          | ), AMO-2,                                      | Reading and Ma                   | ıth Pe       | erformance Target            |
| 5A. Ambitious I<br>Measurable Ob<br>school will redu<br>by 50%. | jectives (AM                     | Os). In six year                 | Reading Goa   | nl #   |                                     |  |                                  |              | <u> </u>                     |
| Baseline data<br>2010-2011                                      | 2011-2012                        | 2012-2013                        | 2013-20       | 014  | 2014                                | 1-2015   | 2015-2016                        | 6 2016-2017  |                              |
|   |                                  |                                  |               |  |                                     |  |                                  |              |                              |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, In 2010-2011, 39% of students in the Black subgroup scorec a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AY Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the satisfactory progress in reading. Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 39% to 46% to meet AYP through Safe Reading Goal #5B: Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In 2010-2011, the percentage of students in the Black In 2010-2011, 39% (19 students) of students in the Black subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as increase from 39% to 46% (19 students of 42) to meet AYP reported by the AYP report. through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of Responsible for Monitoring Strategy Inconsistent 2011-2012 1) EPCEA will implement Administrators, 1) Review FAIR data 1)FAIR FAIR administration and the FAIR assessment to Reading Coach, reports to ensure assessments data monitor student progress classroom teachers teachers are assessing 2)Lessons plans 2) EPCEA will implement students 3)CWT 2)Quarterly meeting with 4)GL meetings Treasures and SRA reading programs with principal and reading fidelity 3) Literacy center coach to monitor student training for classroom progress. 3)Lesson plans teachers (focus on will be submitted weekly differentiated instruction. to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

In 2010-2011, 29% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Student with Disabilities

| Read  | ing Goal #5D:  |  | increase from 2  | subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 29% to 37% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.   |                                    |  |  |  |
|-------|--|--|--|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 2012  | Current Level of Perform   | mance:   | 2013 Expected  | Level of Performance:  |                                    |  |  |  |
| Stude | 10-2011, 29% (15 studen<br>ents with Disabilities subgra<br>Reading Test as reported | oup scored a level 3-5 on t  | with Disabilities the Reading Test wi                  | he percentage of students<br>subgroup scoring levels 3-<br>Il increase from 29% to 37<br>hrough Safe Harbor Crit   | 5 on the FCAT<br>7% (13 students o |  |  |  |
|       | Pı   | roblem-Solving Process   | to Increase Studer                                     | t Achievement  |                                    |  |  |  |
|       | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Toc                     |  |  |  |
| 1     | Inconsistent 2010-2011<br>FAIR administration and<br>data                            | 1)EPCEA will implement<br>the FAIR assessment to<br>monitor student progress<br>2)EPCEA will implement<br>Treasures and SRA<br>reading programs with<br>fidelity 3) Literacy center<br>training for classroom<br>teachers (focus on<br>differentiated instruction. |  | 1)Review FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal and reading coach to monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the |                                    |  |  |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:

academic plan during

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:   | In 2010-2011, 53% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 53% to 58% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |
| In 2009-2010, 53% (46 students) of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test as reported by the AYP report. | In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Reading Test will increase from 53% to 58% (38 students of 66) to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report.   |

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier                                       | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 | Inconsistent 2011-2012<br>FAIR administration and<br>data | 1)EPCEA will implement<br>the FAIR assessment to<br>monitor student progress<br>2)EPCEA will implement<br>Treasures and SRA<br>reading programs with<br>fidelity 3) Literacy center<br>training for classroom<br>teachers (focus on<br>differentiated instruction. | classroom teachers                                     | reports to ensure  | ,               |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g.,<br>PLC,subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible fo<br>Monitoring |  |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| No Data Submitted                           |                        |  |  |  |  |   |  |  |  |

#### Reading Budget:

|                    |                | ı(s)/Material(s)         | Evidence-based Program  |
|--------------------|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Available<br>Amoun | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.00             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.0    |                |                          |                         |
|                    |                |                          | Technology              |
| Available<br>Amoun | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.00             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.0    |                |                          |                         |
|                    |                | nt                       | Professional Developmen |
| Available<br>Amoun | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.00             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.0    |                |                          |                         |
|                    |                |                          | Other                   |
| Available<br>Amoun | Funding Source | Description of Resources | Strategy                |
| \$0.00             | No Data        | No Data                  | No Data                 |
| Subtotal: \$0.0    |                |                          |                         |
| Grand Total: \$0.0 |                |                          |                         |

End of Reading Goa

# Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

| * When using percentages, include the number of students the p | percentage represents next to the percentage (e.g., 70% (35)). |
|--|--|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English a      | at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.        |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.          |  |
| CELLA Goal #1:   |  |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listenir        | ng/speaking:   |

|                          | Problem-Solving Prod         | cess to Increase S  | Student Achievement  |                 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| Anticipated Barrier      | Strategy                     | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|                          |                              | No Data Submitted   |  |                 |
|                          |                              |   |  |                 |
| Students read in English | n at grade level text in a n | nanner similar to no                                      | on-ELL students.   |                 |
| 2. Students scoring pr   | oficient in reading.         |   |  |                 |
| CELLA Goal #2:           |                              |   |  |                 |
| 2012 Current Percent     | of Students Proficient in    | n reading:  |  |                 |
|                          |                              |   |  |                 |
|                          | Problem-Solving Prod         | cess to Increase S  | Student Achievement  |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier      | Strategy                     | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|                          |                              | No Data Submitted   |  |                 |
|                          |                              |   |  |                 |
| Students write in Englis | h at grade level in a manr   | ner similar to non-E                                      | LL students.   |                 |
| 3. Students scoring pr   | oficient in writing.         |   |  |                 |
| CELLA Goal #3:           |                              |   |  |                 |
| 2012 Current Percent     | of Students Proficient in    | n writing:  |  |                 |
|                          |                              |   |  |                 |
|                          | Problem-Solving Prod         | cess to Increase S  | Student Achievement  |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier      | Strategy                     | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|                          |                              | No Data Submitted   |  |                 |

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CELLA Goals

#### **Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

2012 Current Level of Performance:

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)). Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: In 2010-2011, 79% of students in the total subgroup scored 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as reported by the AYP mathematics. report. In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the total subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will Mathematics Goal #1a: increase from 79% to 82% to meet AYP through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In 2011-2012, the percentage of students in the total In 2010-2011, 79% (161 of 204 students) of students in the subgroup scoring levels 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test will total subgroup scored a level 3-5 on the FCAT Math Test as increase from 79% to 82% (161 of 42 students) to meet AYI reported by the AYP report. through Safe Harbor Criteria as reported by the AYP report. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Process Used to Person or Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

|  | Problem-Solvino  | g Process to I                                  | ncrease S  | tudent Achievement   |                            |
|--|--|---|--|--|----------------------------|
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Posit<br>Resp<br>for                            | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>toring                      | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool            |
|  |  | No Data   | Submitted  |  |                            |
|  |  |   |  |  |                            |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo   | student achievement of student of student achievement | data, and refer                                 | ence to "G   | uiding Questions", iden                                      | tify and define areas in n |
| 2b. Florida Alternate A<br>Students scoring at or<br>mathematics.  |  | Level 7 in                                      |  |  |                            |
| Mathematics Goal #2b:  | :  |   |  |  |                            |
| 2012 Current Level of F  | Performance:   |   | 2013 Exp   | ected Level of Perfor  | mance:                     |
|  |  |   |  |  |                            |
|  | Problem-Solvino  | g Process to I                                  | ncrease S  | tudent Achievement   |                            |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Problem-Solving Strategy   | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for                    | on or  | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy          | Evaluation Tool            |
| Anticipated Barrier  |  | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni            | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible                                | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of             | Evaluation Tool            |
|  | Strategy   | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni            | on or<br>tion<br>ponsible<br>toring<br>Submitted         | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy |                            |
| Based on the analysis of improvement for the fo  | Strategy student achievement obliowing group:  | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or<br>tion<br>ponsible<br>toring<br>Submitted         | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy |                            |
| Based on the analysis of<br>of improvement for the fo<br>Ba. FCAT 2.0: Percenta  | Strategy student achievement obliowing group:  | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or<br>tion<br>ponsible<br>toring<br>Submitted         | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy |                            |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formal and the second and the sec | Strategy student achievement obliowing group: ge of students makin   | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or<br>tion<br>ponsible<br>toring<br>Submitted         | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy |                            |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formal and the formal and the formal and the formal and the matics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:   | Strategy  student achievement obliowing group: ge of students making:  | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or<br>tion<br>tion<br>tonsible<br>toring<br>Submitted | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | tify and define areas in r |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formations of the formation of the formatio | Strategy  student achievement obliowing group: ge of students making:  | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or<br>tion<br>tion<br>tonsible<br>toring<br>Submitted | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | tify and define areas in r |
| Anticipated Barrier  Based on the analysis of of improvement for the form of the second of the secon | student achievement obliowing group: ge of students making: Performance:   | Pers<br>Posit<br>Resp<br>for<br>Moni<br>No Data | on or tion consible toring Submitted Tence to "Gi        | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | tify and define areas in r |

| Based on the analysis of sof improvement for the fo                  | student achievement data, an<br>llowing group:  | d refer                       | ence to "Gu                         | uiding Questions", ide                                       | entify and define are | eas in nee |
|--|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------------|------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate As<br>Percentage of students<br>mathematics.   |   |                               |                                     |  |                       |            |
| Mathematics Goal #3b:  |   |                               |                                     |  |                       |            |
| 2012 Current Level of P  | erformance:   |                               | 2013 Exp                            | ected Level of Perfo   | ormance:              |            |
|  |   |                               |                                     |  |                       |            |
|  | Problem-Solving Proces  | ss to I                       | ncrease St                          | udent Achievement  | t                     |            |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Posit<br>Resp<br>for          | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>toring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation T          | ool        |
|  | No  | o Data                        | Submitted                           |  |                       |            |
|  |   |                               |                                     |  |                       |            |
| Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fo                 | student achievement data, an<br>Ilowing group:  | d refer                       | rence to "Gu                        | uiding Questions", ide                                       | entify and define are | eas in nee |
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage making learning gains i Mathematics Goal #4: | In 2011-12, 38% of students in the lowest 25% ( 16 of 43 students)made learning gains on FCAT Math. |                               |                                     |  |                       |            |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:                                   |   |                               | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |                       |            |
| In 2012, 38% (9 students made learning gains on FC                   | In 2012-13<br>FCAT 2.0 r  | 3, we will improve to report. | 44% as measured b                   | by the   |                       |            |
|  | Problem-Solving Proces  | ss to I                       | ncrease St                          | udent Achievement  | t                     |            |

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool               |
|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Inconsistency in the 2012-2013 data and Differenciating instruction | 1) Differentiated instruction (small group, intervention block, centers) 2)Cooperative learning (Kagan) 3) Students Engagement Tools (kagan, Mimeo, Manipulatives 4)District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers 5) Differentiate instruction using a variety of approved programs; AM, Compass, Math Fact and a Flash, Envision Intervention, STAR | Administration/<br>Teacher                             | 1)Review Distrcit Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during | 2) FCAT Scores 3)<br>District |
| 2 |   |  |  |   |                               |

| Based           | I on Amb                           | itious but Achie   | evable Annual   | Measurable Ob   | jecti  | ves (AMOs), AM  | O-2, I  | Reading and Math Pe   | rformance Target  |
|-----------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|
| Measu           | urable Ob<br>I will red            | but Achievable<br>njectives (AMOs<br>uce their achie                           | s). In six year   |   | hool   | Mathematics Go  | oal#  |   | <u></u>   |
|                 | ine data<br>0-2011                 | 2011-2012  | 2012-2013   | 2013-201  | 4      | 2014-201  | 5   | 2015-2016   | 2016-2017   |
|                 |                                    |  |   |   |        |   |   |   |   |
|                 |                                    | analysis of stud<br>at for the follow  |   |   | efere  | ence to "Guiding  | Ques  | tions", identify and c  | define areas in nee                                     |
| Hispa<br>satist | anic, Asia<br>factory p<br>ematics | ubgroups by o<br>an, American<br>progress in ma<br>Goal #5B:<br>Level of Perfo | Indian) not nathematics.  |   |        | a level 3-5 on t<br>report. In 2011-<br>Black subgroup<br>increase from 4<br>Criteria as repo | he FC<br>-2012<br>scorin<br>7% to<br>rted b   | of students in the Bla<br>AT Math Test as rep<br>the percentage of signer the Foundation of Signer 1<br>53% to meet AYP they the AYP report.  | orted by the AYP<br>students in the<br>CAT Math Test wi |
| Black           | subgroup                           |  |   | students in the<br>CAT Math Test  | as     | subgroup scorin increase from 4   | g leve<br>7% to   | rcentage of students<br>els 3-5 on the FCAT I<br>o 53% (23 of 42 stud<br>Criteria as reported I   | Math Test will lents) to meet AYP                       |
|                 |                                    |  | Problem-Sol   | lving Process t   | to I r | ncrease Studer  | nt Ach  | ilevement   |   |
|                 | Antic                              | ipated Barrier   | ^ St  | rategy  | Re     | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring   |   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1               | 2011-20                            | tency in the<br>12 data and<br>ciating instruct                                | follow-up to series through the | ent<br>Envision Math<br>and curriculum<br>will assist in<br>ongoing<br>for teachers 3)<br>te instruction<br>riety of<br>programs; AM,<br>nd, Math Fact<br>h, Envision | Tea    | ninistration/<br>acher  | Asses<br>to en<br>asses<br>2)Qua<br>princi<br>progr<br>will b<br>to pri<br>will b<br>aligni | view Distrcit ssment data reports sure teachers are ssing students arterly meeting with ipal monitor student ress. 3)Lesson plans e submitted weekly incipal and teaching e assessed for ment to the emic plan during | 1) FCAT Scores 2)<br>District<br>Assessment             |
|                 |                                    | analysis of stud   |   |   | efere  | ence to "Guiding  | ) Ques  | tions", identify and c  | define areas in need                                    |
| satist          | factory p                          | anguage Leari<br>progress in ma<br>Goal #5C:                                   |   | t making  |        |   |   |   |   |
| 2012            | Current                            | Level of Perfo   | ormance:  |   |        | 2013 Expected   | d Leve  | el of Performance:  |   |
|                 |                                    |  |   |   |        |   |   |   |   |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| Antic           | cipated Barrier  | Strategy   | P<br>R<br>fo  | Posit<br>Resp<br>or | on or<br>ion<br>onsible<br>toring                                       | Dete<br>Effe                                  | cess Used to<br>ermine<br>ctiveness of<br>itegy  | Evalu   | uation Tool   |
|-----------------|--|--|---|---------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
|                 |  |  | No D  | )ata                | Submitted   |   |  |   |   |
|                 | I on the analysis of sprovement for the following the foll |  | hievement data, and r<br>bgroup:  | refer               | ence to "Gu   | iiding  | Questions", identify a   | and de  | efine areas in ne   |
| satisi          | tudents with Disab<br>factory progress in<br>ematics Goal #5D:   |  | _   |                     | Disabilities<br>Test as rep<br>percentage<br>subgroup s<br>increase fro | subgoorted<br>oorted<br>of s<br>corin<br>om 3 | 38% of students in the proup scored a level 3-d by the AYP report. In tudents in the Studen g levels 3-5 on the FC 8% to 45% to meet Arted by the AYP report   | 5 on<br>n 201<br>ts wit<br>CAT M<br>YP th         | the FCAT Math<br>1-2012, the<br>th Disabilities<br>lath Test will   |
| 2012            | Current Level of P   | erforman   | ce:   |                     | 2013 Expe   | ected   | Level of Performan   | ce:   |   |
| Stude           | 10-2011, 38% (20 s<br>ents with Disabilities<br>Math Test as report  | subgroup   | scored a level 3-5 on   | the                 | with Disabi<br>Math Test  | lities<br>will ir<br>'P thr                   | the percentage of stud<br>subgroup scoring leve<br>ncrease from 38% to 4<br>rough Safe Harbor Crit   | ls 3-5<br>45% (                                   | on the FCAT<br>(17 students of 3                                    |
|                 |  | Probl  | em-Solving Process  | to I                | ncrease St  | uder  | nt Achievement   |   |   |
|                 | Anticipated Bar  | rier   | Strategy  | R                   | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible<br>Monitorin                        | for   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   |   | Evaluation To   |
| 1               | Inconsistency in the 2011-2012 data and Differenciating instr  | d foll<br>uction ser<br>Dev<br>2)<br>spe<br>spe<br>ans<br>que<br>Difi<br>usi<br>app<br>Stu | All teachers will take ow-up training in mathies through Staff velopment District Envision Mathiecialist and curriculum ecialist will assist in swering ongoing estions for teachers 3) ferentiate instructioning a variety of proved programs; AM, ady Island, Math Factid a Flash, Envision ervention, STAR | Tea<br>)            | ministration,<br>acher  | /   | 1)Review Distrcit Assessment data reports of ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting of principal monitor students and teach will be submitted weet to principal and teach will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during | orts<br>re<br>with<br>dent<br>ans<br>ekly<br>ning | 1)FCAT scores<br>2)District<br>Assessments                          |
|                 |  |  | hievement data, and r   | refer               | ence to "Gu   | ıiding  | Questions", identify a   | and de  | efine areas in ne   |
| 5E. E<br>satist | conomically Disady<br>factory progress in<br>ematics Goal #5E:   | /antaged   | students not making   | g                   | Disadvanta<br>Math Test<br>percentage<br>subgroup s<br>increase fro     | iges s<br>as re<br>e of s<br>corin<br>om 5    | 57% of students in the subgroup scored a leve ported by the AYP reptudents in the Econom g levels 3-5 on the FC 7% to 62% to meet Arted by the AYP report  | el 3-5<br>oort. I<br>nically<br>CAT M<br>YP the   | on the FCAT<br>n 2011-2012, tl<br>n Disadvantaged<br>lath Test will |
| 2012            | Current Level of P   | erforman   | ce:   |                     |   |   | Level of Performan   |   |   |
| Econo           | 10-2011, 57% (50 s<br>mically Disadvantag<br>CAT Math Test as re   | es subgro  | up scored a level 3-5   | on                  | Economical<br>the FCAT M<br>students of                                 | lly Di<br>lath<br>f 66 s                      | the percentage of stuc<br>sadvantaged subgroup<br>Test will increase from<br>students) to meet AYP<br>rted by the AYP report   | scor<br>57%<br>thro                               | ing levels 3-5 or<br>to 62% (41                                     |
|                 |  | Probl  | em-Solving Process  | to I                | ncrease St  | uder  | nt Achievement   |   |   |
|                 |  |  |   | T                   | Person or   |   | Process Used to  |   |   |

|  | Anticipated Barrier                               | Strategy  | Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool                            |
|--|---|---|---|---|--|
|  | 2011-2012 data and<br>Differenciating instruction | All teachers will be continue training in new math series through Staff Development     District Envision Math specialist and curriculum specialist will assist in answering ongoing questions for teachers |   | 1)Review Distrcit Assessment data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students 2)Quarterly meeting with principal monitor student progress. 3)Lesson plans will be submitted weekly to principal and teaching will be assessed for alignment to the academic plan during | 1)FCAT scores<br>2)District<br>Assessments |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g.,<br>PLC,subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | ١                                      | No Data Submitte   | d  |  |  |

#### Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | ent                      |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

| * Whe | en using percentages                                   | , includ   | de the number of student:   | ts the               | e percentage                                      | e rep        | resents (e.g., 70% (:  | 35)).  |  |
|-------|--|--|---|----------------------|---|--------------|--|--------|--|
|       |  |  | ent achievement data,<br>for the following group  |                      | I reference                                       | to "(        | Guiding Questions",  | , ider | ntify and define                           |
| Leve  | FCAT2.0: Students<br>Il 3 in science.<br>nce Goal #1a: | scori  | ing at Achievement  |                      |   |              | ementary School: 20<br>ed at or above level                  |        |  |
| 2012  | 2 Current Level of                                     | Perfo  | rmance:   |                      | 2013 Exp  | ecte         | ed Level of Perforr  | mano   | ce:  |
|       | 012-2013, we will in<br>CAT 2.0 Science T              |  | e to 63% as measured b  |                      |   |              | we will improve to<br>Science Test.                          | 63%    | as measured by                             |
|       |  | Proble   | em-Solving Process t  | to I                 | ncrease S <sup>.</sup>                            | tud∈         | ent Achievement  |        |  |
|       | Anticipated Bar  | rier   | Strategy  |                      | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible<br>Monitoring | e for        | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy |        | Evaluation Tool                            |
| 1     | Scheduling   | s<br>s<br>2<br>I<br>c<br>c<br>a<br>v<br>u<br>u<br>s<br>iii<br>u<br>s<br>t<br>t | 1) Science lab is scheduled for all students. 2) Kagan Identify 'big idea" key concepts, knowledge and skills that describe what students will understand. 3) Engage students in science inquiry to develop understanding of science concepts and the nature of science. 4) small group handson activities 5) science word wall | tea                  | lministrator,<br>achers                           | ,            | observation, lessor<br>plans                                 | า      | 1)FCAT scores<br>2)District<br>Assessments |
| Pasar | d on the analysis o                                    | of stude   | ent achievement data  | and                  | roforence   | †O "         | Cuiding Ougstions"   | ider   | ctify and define                           |
|       |  |  | ent achievement data,<br>for the following group  |                      | releience   | 10 1         | Julaing Questions ,  | luei   | itify and define                           |
| Stud  | Florida Alternate Alents scoring at Lence Goal #1b:    |  | sment:<br>4, 5, and 6 in science  | <u></u> .            |   |              |  |        |  |
| 2012  | 2 Current Level of                                     | Perfo  | rmance:   |                      | 2013 Ехр  | ecte         | ed Level of Perforr  | mano   | ce:  |
|       |  |  |   |                      |   |              |  |        |  |
|       |  | Proble   | em-Solving Process t  | to I                 | ncrease S   | tude         | ent Achievement  |        |  |
| Antio | cipated Barrier  | Strate   | egy P   | Posit<br>Resp<br>For | tion<br>consible                                  | Dete<br>Effe | cess Used to<br>ermine<br>ectiveness of<br>ategy             | Eva    | luation Tool                               |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:

No Data Submitted

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. |                 |                   |   |  |                 |  |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| Science Goal #2a:  |                 |                   |   |  |                 |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                 |                   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:     |  |                 |  |
|  |                 |                   |   |  |                 |  |
|  |                 |                   |   |  |                 |  |
|  | Problem-Solving | Process to        | ncrease S                               | Student Achievement  |                 |  |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy        | Pos<br>Res<br>for | son or<br>ition<br>ponsible<br>iitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| No Data S  |                 |                   | Submitted                               |  |                 |  |

|  | of student achievement d<br>vement for the following g |           | reference                           | to "Guiding Questions  | s", identify and define |
|--|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: |  |           |                                     |  |                         |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |  |           | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |  |                         |
|  |  |           |                                     |  |                         |
|  | Problem-Solving Proc                                   | ess to I  | ncrease S                           | tudent Achievemen  | t                       |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | for       |                                     | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool         |
|  |  | No Data S | Submitted                           |  |                         |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD<br>Participants<br>(e.g.,<br>PLC,subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | No Data Submitted      |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       | ·                        | ·              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Science Goals

# Writing Goals

<sup>\*</sup> When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

|        | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |  |  |   |  |  |  |
|--------|--|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 3.0 a  | CAT 2.0: Students scor<br>nd higher in writing.<br>ng Goal #1a:  | ing at Achievement Le   | higher on FCAT<br>students meet                            | In 2011-2012, 95% of students scored Level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writing. In 2012-2013, the percentage of students meeting high standards on the FCAT Writing Test will be 96%.    |   |  |  |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perfo   | rmance:   | 2013 Expecte   | ed Level of Performance  | e:  |  |  |  |
| Writir | 12,% of students<br>ng(meeting standards is 4<br>e School Accountability F   | 1.0 and above) as reporte   | ed standards on t  | In 2012-2013, the percentage of students meeting high standards on the FCAT Writing Test(meeting standards is 4.0 and above) will be 96% or greater.                               |   |  |  |  |
|        | Prok   | olem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude   | ncrease Student Achievement  |   |  |  |  |
|        | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring     | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool                                   |  |  |  |
| 1      | problematic at this<br>time. Student<br>proficiency has<br>exceeded 90% in the<br>past 2 years. However,   | curriculum. The 6 Traits<br>of Writing and Kathy<br>Robinson are highly<br>structured and<br>scaffolded writing | Administrators,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Classroom<br>teachers | 1)Review common<br>assessment reports to<br>ensure teachers are<br>assessing students<br>2)Lesson plans will be<br>submitted weekly<br>3)Administration will<br>observe during CWT | 1)Common<br>Assessments<br>2)CWT<br>3)GL Meetings |  |  |  |

| particiapted in a school |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| based in-service to      |  |  |
| align common rubrics     |  |  |
| throughout each grade    |  |  |
| level                    |  |  |
| 10.00                    |  |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD<br>Participants<br>(e.g. ,<br>PLC,subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | N                                      | lo Data Submitte   | d  |  |  |

#### Writing Budget:

| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            | •                        |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|          |                          | •              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Writing Goals

### Attendance Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and ref of improvement:       | erence   | to "Guiding   | g Questions", identify a                                     | nd define areas in need |
|---|----------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 1. Attendance   |          |   |  |                         |
| Attendance Goal #1:   |          |   |  |                         |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate:   | 2013 Exp | ected Attendance Ra   | te:  |                         |
|   |          |   |  |                         |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive<br>Absences (10 or more) |          | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |  |                         |
|   |          |   |  |                         |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessi<br>Tardies (10 or more)    | ive      | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)  |  |                         |
|   |          |   |  |                         |
| Problem-Solving Proce   | ess to I | ncrease S   | tudent Achievement   |                         |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit<br>Resp<br>for                       |          | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>toring                                   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool         |
| No Data Submitted   |          |   |  |                         |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No Data Submitted                           |                        |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

# Suspension Goal(s)

<sup>\*</sup> When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference of improvement: | Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Suspension   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Suspension Goal #1:   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions                              | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School                       | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-<br>School  |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions                                | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School<br>Suspensions  |  |  |  |  |

|   |                   | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-<br>of-School |  |                    |  |
|---|-------------------|--|--|--------------------|--|
|   |                   |  |  |                    |  |
|   | Problem-Solvir    | ng Process to I  | ncrease S  | tudent Achievement |  |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi<br>Resp |                   | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>toring                          | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool    |  |
|   | No Data Submitted |  |  |                    |  |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | Ν                                      | lo Data Submitted  | d  |  |  |

#### Suspension Budget:

| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developn | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |

### Parent Involvement Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

|   | d on the analysis of pare ed of improvement: | nt involvement data, and  | d reference to "Gui                                    | ding Questions", identify   | and define areas |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|------------------|--|--|
| 1. Pa   | rent Involvement                             |   |  |   |                  |  |  |
| Pare  | nt I nvolvement Goal #                       | 1:  | In 2011-2012   | In 2011-2012, Edison Park's parent volunteers logged  |                  |  |  |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. |  |   |  | 4,257 hours of volunteer time at the school.  |                  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:   |  |   | 2013 Expecte   | 2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement:   |                  |  |  |
| In 2011-2012, Edison Park's parent volunteers logged 4,257 hours of volunteer time at the school              |  |   |  | In the 2012-2013, parent volunteer hours will increase to 5,257 as measured by the volunteer sign-in sheet. |                  |  |  |
|   | Pro  | blem-Solving Process t  | to Increase Stude                                      | ent Achievement   |                  |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier                          | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |  |  |
| 1   | Getting parents involved                     | Offer extended hours<br>for conferences,<br>increasing PTA<br>membership, Reaching<br>out to parents via<br>Social Media (facebook) | Administration,<br>Secretary                           | Parent Participation  | Sign in log      |  |  |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | N                                      | No Data Submitted  | d  |  |  |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) |                          |                |                     |  |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Strategy                              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |  |
| No Data                               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |  |

|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Technology               |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

# Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

\* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).

| Based on the analysis o | f school data, identify and d | efine areas in ne   | ed of improvement:   |                 |  |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--|
| 1. STEM                 |                               |   |  |                 |  |
| STEM Goal #1:           |                               |   |  |                 |  |
|                         | Problem-Solving Proces        | ss to Increase S  | tudent Achievement   |                 |  |
| Anticipated Barrier     | Strategy                      | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |
| No Data Submitted       |                               |   |  |                 |  |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | No Data Submitted      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| Evidence-based Progr  | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          | -              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

### **Bully Prevention Goal:**

In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports

Goal:

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| fourt<br>Bully<br>instr<br>Peac<br>help<br>Bully<br>and to<br>class<br>instr<br>Peac   | uction on peer conflict<br>remaking Skills curricul<br>prevent bullying incide<br>Prevention Goal: In 20<br>fifth graders will partici<br>ses, and all students in<br>uction on peer conflict | participate in "Anti-<br>udents in K-3 will rece<br>strategies through<br>lum at guidance classes<br>ent reports Goal<br>012-2013 100% of four<br>pate in "Anti-Bullying"<br>K-3 will receive<br>strategies through<br>lum at guidance classes | s to Bully Preventio<br>fifth graders w<br>all students in<br>strategies thro<br>guidance class<br>Goal #1: | n Goal: In 2012-2013 10<br>ill participate in "Anti-Bu<br>K-3 will receive instruct<br>ugh Peacemaking Skills<br>es to help prevent bullyi  | ıllying" classes, and<br>ion on peer conflict<br>curriculum at |  |  |  |
| 2012   | 2 Current level:  |  | 2013 Expecte  | 2013 Expected level:  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6 of fourth grade student<br>ention   | s participate in bully   | fifth graders w<br>all students in<br>strategies thro   | Bully Prevention Goal: In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports Goal #1: |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pro   | blem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Stude   | ent Achievement   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring  | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |  |  |  |
| 1  | Scheduling  | PBS Program iniciated<br>schoolwide, PBS team<br>to deal with any<br>concerns (meets twice<br>a month), Guidance<br>classes scheduled<br>school wide, Love and<br>Logic strategies<br>inplemented  | Administrator,<br>Guidance<br>Counselor   | Observation   | Reduced incident<br>reports, Bully<br>Prevention quiz          |  |  |  |

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity

Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates<br>(e.g., early<br>release) and<br>Schedules<br>(e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |  |  |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | No Data Submitted      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Bully Prevention Goal:

In 2012-2013 100% of fourth and fifth graders will participate in "Anti-Bullying" classes, and all students in K-3 will receive instruction on peer conflict strategies through Peacemaking Skills curriculum at guidance classes to help prevent bullying incident reports

Goal(s)

#### FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based F  | Program(s)/Material(s) |                             |                |                     |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Goal              | Strategy               | Description of Resources    | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data           | No Data                | No Data                     | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                   |                        |                             |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology        |                        |                             |                |                     |
| Goal              | Strategy               | Description of<br>Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data           | No Data                | No Data                     | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                   |                        |                             |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Deve | elopment               |                             |                |                     |
| Goal              | Strategy               | Description of Resources    | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data           | No Data                | No Data                     | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                   |                        |                             |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other             |                        |                             |                |                     |
| Goal              | Strategy               | Description of Resources    | Funding Source | Available Amount    |
| No Data           | No Data                | No Data                     | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                   |                        |                             |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                   |                        |                             |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance



Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
|-------------------------------------|--------|
| No data submitted                   |        |

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming year

Meeting dates: October 25, 2012

# AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

### SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Lee School District<br>EDI SON PARK CREATI<br>2010-2011 | VE AND EXF | PRESSIVE A | ARTS SCI | HOOL    |                           |   |
|---|------------|------------|----------|---------|---------------------------|---|
|   | Reading    | Math       | Writing  | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above) | 89%        | 93%        | 95%      | 76%     | 353                       | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making<br>Learning Gains                  | 71%        | 55%        |          |         | 126                       | 3 ways to make gains: Improve FCAT Levels Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2  |
| Adequate Progress of<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?    | 61% (YES)  | 43% (NO)   |          |         | 104                       | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.  |
| FCAT Points Earned                                      |            |            |          |         | 583                       |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%                                   |            |            |          |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |            |            |          |         | В                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

| Lee School District<br>EDI SON PARK CREATI<br>2009-2010 | EDISON PARK CREATIVE AND EXPRESSIVE ARTS SCHOOL |           |         |         |                           |   |  |  |
|---|---|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|--|--|
|   | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |  |  |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above) | 92%   | 92%       | 92%     | 83%     |                           | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |  |  |
| % of Students Making<br>Learning Gains                  | 65%   | 67%       |         |         | 132                       | 3 ways to make gains:  Improve FCAT Levels  Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5  Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2   |  |  |
| Adequate Progress of<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?    |   | 50% (YES) |         |         | 92                        | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.  |  |  |
| FCAT Points Earned                                      |   |           |         |         | 583                       |   |  |  |
| Percent Tested = 100%                                   |   |           |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |  |  |
| School Grade*   |   |           |         |         | В                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |  |  |